MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 6, 1927.

The fifth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1927, was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on January 6, 1927.

The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Greenleaf,
Mr. Mowbray,
Mr. Medary,
Mr. Delano,
Mr. Taft,
Mr. Garfield,
also Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Executive Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The minutes of the Meeting held December 2, 1926, were approved. Mr. Greenleaf made a few changes in his statement quoted on page 20, which were agreed to, as follows:

line 9, instead of word "no" to read "not".
lines 23 to 25, with words underscored inserted and words marked out omitted: that means, not, <u>of course</u>, that it shall consist of ~~high~~ arches ~~and architecturally~~ looming high in the air, but that it shall have ~~itself shady lines, its piers, its~~ scale in harmony with the bridge scale.

2. REELECTION OF THE CHAIRMAN: Upon motion, properly moved and seconded, Mr. Charles Moore was unanimously reelected Chairman of the Commission.

3. LANDSCAPE PLAN, COAST GUARD MEMORIAL: Mr. George Howe, arcnitect, of Philadelphia, was in conference with the Commission regarding the landscape plan for the Coast Guard World War Memorial. Mr. Howe stated that since the general landscape plan had been agreed upon by the Commission, at the meeting on December 2, 1926, the Coast Guard World War Memorial Committee had asked

that he submit an estimate of cost of the planting so that they can make the necessary arrangements to secure additional funds for the memorial. Mr.Howe said the triangle measures approximately 110 feet on a side and that he contemplated getting as part of the planting:

8 cedar trees 18 feet high,
5 American elms,
16 Rhododendrons, or laurel.

Mr. Howe said he was figuring on an estimate of $5,000 for the planting and asked Mr. Greenleaf whether he thought that amount sufficient. Mr. Greenleaf said he thought that amount should be sufficient to make a good beginning in the planting, but that he was particularly concerned as to its maintenance. Under present methods of operation at Arlington, he said, there is no certainty that any amount of fine planting will remain so for a long time, and cited difficulties experienced in providing the planting for the Soldiers' Memorial Cross, erected by the American Womens' Legion, for which a landscape plan was designed, but the planting was never carried out. Mr. Moore said that in view this situation he felt the time was ripe for the Secretary of War to bring about the needed change,--that the man who attends to the planting in Arlington at the present time is a gardener, who maintains greenhouses and spends his time on ordinary flowers whereas he should be attending to trees.

Mr. Greenleaf said he favored for the Coast Guard World War Memorial three things: Elm trees for shade, evergreens for backing (arbor vitae pyramidalis), and for the angle of the triangle laurel or rhododendrons. Mr. Greenleaf said the $5,000 will not be surficient for 20' specimens.

Mr. Delano called attention to cryptomaria, which grow so well on Long Island, but Mr. Greenleaf felt that this plant is better adapted to a more northern climate. As for box bushes and their splendid growth at the Lincoln Memorial,

Mr. Greenleaf said this is primarily due to the fact that the planting at the Lincoln Memorial has had the right sort of supervision by the Landscape Architect of the Office of Public Buildings and Parks, Mr. Irving Payne, who in the first place selected the proper kind of box bushes and then cared for them as they have grown; it is that procedure and supervision, Mr. Greenleaf said, which is needed in the Arlington National Cemetery. Mr. Moore stated that during the past year or so Mr. John Small, Landscape Architect in this city, has been attending to the planting in this way at the Adams Memorial in Rock Creek Cemetery, with marked results.

Mr. Howe said he appreciated the information and advice given him by the Commission and would take up the matter further with the Coast Guard World War Memorial Committee in the development of the project.

4. GARNET-PATTERSON JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL: Major L. E. Atkins, Assistant Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, submitted in behalf of Mr. A.L. Harris, Municipal Architect (who he said was taken to a hospital during the past 24 hours) plans for the Garnet-Patterson Junior High School (colored), to be erected at 10th and U Streets and Vermont Avenue, N.W. Major Atkins said the building involved an expenditure of about $200,000.

The Commission, after considering the design in connection with the location proposed, felt that the building was of sufficient importance for it to face Vermont Avenue (which it is understood is to be extended) at the head of Florida Avenue, instead of on Tenth Street as proposed. Major Atkins was therefore requested to have the Municipal Architect's office prepare studies accordingly and submit them to the Commission.

The Commission felt that an opportunity offered itself in this instance for a building of a particularly good design.

5. DESIGNS FOR CHAPELS AND MONUMENTS IN EUROPE: Major X. H. Price, Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission, submitted designs for World War memorial chapels and monuments to be erected in Europe, as follows:

1. WAEREGHEM, BELGIUM (Flanders Field): Revised design, prepared by Dr. Paul P. Cret, in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on October 16, 1926.

The Commission suggested that the entrance door be enlarged and the facade restudied accordingly. The Commission advised that study be given to the interior of the chapel (Exhibit A).

2. MEUSE-ARGONNE (Romagne): Two schemes, A and B, prepared by York and Sawyer, Architects, were submitted. Scheme A represented a classical treatment; scheme B, the French romanesque. Attention was called to the fact that this was to be the largest memorial chapel, in the largest of the American World War cemeteries. Mr. Taft was particularly pleased with Scheme B, saying Scheme A, representing the classical, is universal; whereas Scheme B has in it mystery and charm.

The Commission did not regard Scheme A well related to the site. The Commission unanimously approved Scheme B (Exhibit B).

3. BROCKWOOD, ENGLAND: A new study of design A, prepared by Mr. Egerton Swartwout, Architect, in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on October 16th, was submitted. The Commission thought the chapel well designed and approved it.(Exhibit C)

Special consideration was given to the general layout of the grounds and the approach to the chapel. The Commission advised that study be given to the axis leading from the British colonial cemetery in its relation to the main axis of the American cemetery. Instead of gravel or concrete shown in the plan about the chapel, the Commission recommended that this be replaced by a more simple treatment of flagstones set flush with the grass so that the chapel would seem to rise from the sod. The Commission also recommended doing away with the garden hedge and carving the hedge out of the trees, as suggested by Mr. Greenleaf.

The Commission felt that one flagpole, instead of two, as suggested by the design, was sufficient, and advised that the location of it should be given special study, with a view to locating it in as inconspicuous a place as possible. The Commission concurred in the suggestion of Mr. Greenleaf that if a flagpole in this cemetery could be dispensed with it should be done.

4. WORLD WAR MONUMENT NEAR BONY: Sketches A and B for a monument to be erected near Bony, prepared by Dr. Paul P. Cret, Architect, were submitted. The monument is to commemorate the operations of the American troops with the British Army in Europe during the World War. The Commission approved Scheme A,--a memorial monument having columns (Exhibit D).

5. MONTSEC (ST.MIHIEL): Three schemes (A B and C) for a memorial monument at Montsec (St.Mihiel), prepared by Mr. Egerton Swartwout, Architect, were submitted. The monument is to commemorate the services of the American forces in

the St. Mihiel operation.

Attention was called to the fact that Montsec is an isolated hill some twelve miles east of the village of St. Mihiel, the summit rising 140 meters from the general level of the plain (39.37 inches to one meter)

Scheme A represented a circular colonnade, with columns 28 feet high, which was regarded well adapted to the topography. Scheme B represented a square colonnade, which in appearance resembled the Lincoln Memorial. The Commission regarded this design inappropriate for the location. Scheme C represented a simple shaft about 18' x 15', 70 feet high, to be raised on a series of terraces and surmounted by an emblematic group in mass. This design was not favored as a memorial for this location.

The Commission approved design A (Exhibit E).

6. MONTFAUCON: The Commission considered further Schemes 1, 2 and 3, prepared by Mr. John Russell Pope, Architect, submitted at the meeting on December 2d, for the World War monument at Montfaucon. Major Price again stated that this monument will be the most important of the memorial monuments of the World War to be erected by the United States Government in Europe, and that General Pershing is decidedly in favor of Scheme 2, the memorial column, which is to be 150 feet high and will be visible for miles,-from Verdun and other places of historic importance. Major Price said the monument will be erected at the place where the Americans did the greatest amount of fighting,--where the fighting was tremendous in four or five different places and 1,500,000 Americans were engaged in battle.

The Commission approved Scheme 2 (the column)(Exhibit F). The design is described by the Architect, as follows:

> Scheme 2:--is a Doric column about 24 feet in diameter rising from a retaining wall in which is a door giving into a small Memorial Chamber and also for access to the top of the column. A forecourt is also provided with a map, showing points of interest of the surrounding country, and the whole is approached by a series of steps from the road level. The top of the retaining wall is approximately at high point of the hill.

The Commission concurred in the recommendation of Mr. Greenleaf that from 10 to 20 acres be made available for landscape development in connection with this memorial.

7. CHATEAU THIERRY MEMORIAL MONUMENT: Major Price stated that the American Battle Monuments Commission concurs in the suggestion of General Pershing that the three greatest monuments,-Montfaucon, Chateau Thierry, and Montsec (St.Mihiel), are to be properly related in accordance with the importance of American fighting operations in France, and that it is feared the monument for Chateau Thierry, the design of which was approved by the Commission of Fine Arts on October 16, 1926, will be too large; that therefore Dr. Cret had been requested to submit a new drawing of this memorial for the purpose of showing the extent to which the proposed memorial may be reduced in size without disturbing its general effect. Major Price quoted from a letter sent to Dr. Cret, as follows:

> "In explanation of this request, it may be stated that General Pershing is quite concerned that this memorial as at present planned may be more imposing than the one to be erected at Montfaucon. He feels

very strongly concerning this, as the Meuse-Argonne operation was by far our most important operation, and the memorial to commemorate it should be the most imposing."

The Commission inspected the revised design, which in the opinion of Dr. Cret represented a reduction that would be permissible and at the same time provide adequate treatment. The Commission felt it would be a great mistake to reduce the design of the monument as approved; they regarded it none too large to be effective in the landscape. Therefore, the Commission advised that if for any reason the American Battle Monuments Commission should decide that a monument of the size contemplated by the approved design should not be erected at Chateau Thierry, the Commission of Fine Arts would have an entirely new study submitted by the architect (Exhibit G).

8. BONY, FRANCE (Somme American Military Cemetery): Two designs, Plan No.3 and Plan No.4, prepared by the firm of Mellor, Meigs and Howe, architects, of Philadelphia, were submitted for the proposed chapel at Bony. These designs had been made in accordance with the recommendations of this Commission on Oct.16th.

Plan No.3 consisted of a chamber for a chapel and a chamber for a museum, with a connecting portico.

Plan No.4 represented a monumental structure, resembling an obelisk, simple in design with a minimum of ornament, and disassociated from the museum. Large blocks of stone are to be used in its construction. The architects felt that a subdued lighting would be appropriate for the chapel, whereas the museum should be well lighted, but they did not think that these two features could well be combined in one structure. The architects therefore recommended that the museum exhibits be placed in the visitors' room or in a special room in connection with the guardian's house, which can be easily heated and lighted with large windows.

The Commission were highly in favor of Plan No.4 for this chapel, which they regarded admirably suited to the landscape. The Commission appreciated the simplicity of the design and its good proportions.

The Commission also approved the location for the chapel as shown in Plan No.4, terminating the longitudinal axis of the graves area and facing the crosses which mark the graves, so situated also as to fit into the composition by incorporating it in an enclosing wall, as had been recommended by the Commission of Fine Arts on October 16th, with a view to giving it a "Campo Santo" effect. The Commission noted that at the proposed location the topography slopes towards the chapel, and recommended that this be overcome by raising the path surrounding the graves a few feet, thereby giving the chapel a higher elevation, so that it shall overlook the entire cemetery. (Exhibit H)

9. YPRES, BELGIUM: A preliminary design, prepared by Messrs. Mellor, Meigs and Howe, architects, for a memorial monument to be erected near Ypres, Belgium, was submitted, to commemorate the services in that vicinity of the 27th and 30th American divisions. The memorial is to be a small one, for which $7,500 has been allotted for its construction. It was noted that this monument will be in the British fighting area.

The design suggested a simple solid structure, with some inscriptions, which might fitingly and yet inconspicuously be erected in this area. The Commission approved the design with the suggestion that a scale drawing be made and submitted in accordance with this design (Exhibit I).

10. OISE-AISNE (Fere en Tardenois): A revised design was submitted for the memorial chapel in the Oise-Aisne American Military Cemetery, prepared by Messrs. Cram and Ferguson, Architects.

The Commission gave the design very careful consideration. The plan suggested "a solid and almost military block of masonry, the central portion being an open arcade, the arches being filled in at the back with an open colonnade. At one end of this central feature is a small chapel, at the other, a small room which may be used as a museum".

The Commission advised restudy of the plan (Scheme B,-5-10), substituting one large open apse in the center and removing the two small apses from the end pavilions. An altar or other symbol of sacrifice was suggested for the open apse in the center, flanking chapel and museum to make a good balance of the whole. The French romanesque style of architecture was recommended.

The Commission called attention to the McKinley Memorial at Niles, Ohio, and felt that a memorial chapel similar to it, but executed in the French romanesque, would be very appropriate.

An alternate suggestion was made as to a restudy of Scheme A, dated August 3, 1926, marked S-6, the restudy to indicate a chapel consisting of a single element rather than the cruciform chapel with tower surmounting the crossing. The element suggested should be the nave of the cruciform chapel marked Scheme A developed into a simple rectangular form, possibly terminating in an apse and designed in the French romanesque manner, rather than in the later period indicated in Scheme B.

The American Battle Monuments Commission was informed accordingly (Exhibit J).

11. AISNE MARNE (Belleau Wood): Chapel A revised design, prepared by Cram and Ferguson, Architects, in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission of Fine Arts on October 16, 1926, as to simplifying the design but retaining the tower-like effect, was submitted. The Commission approved the design (Exhibit K)

12. ST.MIHIEL CEMETERY (Thiaucourt): Further studies of design B, prepared by Thomas Harlan Ellett, Architect, made in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission of Fine Arts on October 16th, were submitted for the chapel to be erected at Thiaucourt, France.

The Commission approved the design (Exhibit L). The Commission suggested that studies be submitted for a sculptural object on a pedestal proposed at the center in front of the chapel.

6. SEVILLE INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION: Commissioner General Thomas E. Campbell (Ex-Governor of Arizona), of the Seville International Exposition Commission, and Mr. John N. Dennison, secretary, were in conference with the Commission to consider plans of development for the Exposition.

Governor Campbell said "the problem is the responsibility of constructing a building for the United States Government to participate in the Exposition at Seville, Spain, which is to open October 12, 1928, so we have ample time if

we make progress. The State Department, under which I am working as Commissioner General, is anxious to have a permanent building; at the same time the Department does not want to spend too much money on it. Congress has authorized $700,000 for the Exposition and $200,000 has been thus far appropriated. I recently asked the Appropriations Committee for $200,000 additional. It should be possible to erect the permanent building for that amount, since it would mean fully twice that in Spain. After the Exposition this permanent building is to be used for a consulate. We propose to erect also one or two temporary buildings to house the exhibits by the United States Government. The type of architecture we recommend is the Spanish-American type, which was agreed upon at a conference of members of the Seville Exposition Commission and the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts on December 15, 1926, at which time it was also agreed that there should be no competition, but that five leading architects are to be recommended by the Commission of Fine Arts that would be asked to submit photographs of their completed work, which would form the basis for the selection of an architect.

Mr. Caemmerer stated that he had seen the Exposition buildings at Seville, which have been in the process of construction for the past ten years; and that they are located in the midst of a beautiful park area, along a boulevard, a short distance outside of the old city of Seville.

Governor Campbell submitted an interesting book of views of the Exposition buildings. He said they are about 75% completed. The United States building is to be located on a triangular space of ~~XXXXX~~ two acres, adjacent to a boulevard, beyond which is the Rio Guadalquivir. As for a suitable United States building Governor Campbell thought the style suggested by the San Diego Exposition or at the Rio Janeiro Centennial Exposition very acceptable.

The Commission gave careful consideration to the matter of suggesting architects whom they thought qualified to design a building of the Spanish-American type, and the following six architects were agreed upon, as being also well distributed geographically:

Mr. Arthur Brown, Jr., 251 Kearney Street, San Francisco, California;
Mr. Marion Wyeth, Palm Beach, Florida;
Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue Associates, 2 West 47th Street, New York City;
Mr. Wm. E. Parsons, 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois;
Johnson, Kaufmann and Coate, 510 Union Bank Building, Los Angeles, Cal.;
Mr. Reginald Davis Johnson, 607 Union Bank Building, ~~San Francisco~~ Los Angeles, Cal.

A report to this effect was made to Governor Campbell (Exhibit M). The Commission also advised that a landscape plan be developed in connection with the building, for which Mr. Greenleaf suggested certain landscape architects, whose names will be brought later to the attention of Governor Campbell.

(Mr. Moore having since been informed that there is no one now in the office of the Grosvenor Goodhue Associates competent to design a good building of the Spanish-American type, their architect thus qualified being now in business for himself, asked Governor Campbell to omit the name of the Grosvenor Goodhue Associates from the list, which he did and asked for another name to take their place. Mr. Moore suggested Wm. Templeton Johnson, Architect, 503 Electric Building, San Diego, California, who designed the Art Gallery there.)

7. PORTRAIT OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT: Under date of January 4, 1927, the following letter was received from Hon. Simeon D. Fess, Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, asking advice with regard to a portrait of Theodore Roosevelt, which the Committee has before them:

"My dear Doctor Moore:

At a meeting of the Joint Committee on the Library today I was requested to ask for a report of your Commission on a portrait of Theodore Roosevelt by George Burrows Torrey, which Mr. George Prince of New York desires to sell to the Government.

This portrait is in the room of the Joint Committee on the Library in the Capitol. If you will 'phone my office when your Commission finds it convenient to view the portrait, the Committee room will be opened.

Yours very truly,
Simeon D. Fess."

The Commission inspected the portrait during the afternoon of January 6th,

and disapproved it, as being without merit. In size the portrait measured about 4 x 3 feet, framed, and was said to be an enlarged photograph that had been painted. It was the unanimous opinion of the Commission that the picture is without merit as a likeness, a painting, or a work of art. (Exhibit K).

8. ARMY BARRACKS: The secretary reported that the War Department proposes to spend $7,020,000 during this fiscal year for Army Barracks and other buildings throughout the United States, of which $410,000 has been allotted for Camp Meade and $500,000 for Fort Humphreys. Mr. Delano, who in behalf of the Commission and at the request of the Chairman, had conferred with Major General B. F. Cheatham, The Quartermaster General, about the matter, reported that the Secretary of War has designated Mr. Arthur Loomis Harmon, Architect, 19 West 44th Street, New York City, to design Army buildings.

The Commission expressed their deep interest in this matter and again called attention to the fine type of Army buildings represented by the War College group in this city. The Commission recommended that in connection with the plans for buildings at Camp Meade and Fort Humphreys a landscape plan be prepared for each group, properly related to the Greater Washington plan of development.

9. TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER: Mr. Delano said that in connection with the Army Barracks and proposed Insignia for the Army, concerning which he had been requested by the Chairman of the Commission to talk with General Cheatham, they considered also the problem of completing the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, and that accordingly General Cheatham had arranged that they consult the Secretary of War in regard to the matter. The conference with Secretary of War Dwight F. Davis was arranged for 11 o'clock on January 6th, which Mr. Delano attended. The Quartermaster General asked the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts by letter of January 6th in regard to the program of competition, contemplated by the Act

approved July 3, 1926 (Public Resolution No.44, 69th Congress), providing for the completion of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, as follows:

> "RESOLVED BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to secure competitive designs according to such regulations as he may adopt and to complete the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in the Arlington National Cemetery, together with such inclosure as may be deemed necessary, and a sum not to exceed $50,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose: PROVIDED, That the accepted designs of such tomb and inclosure shall be subject to the approval of the Arlington Cemetery Commission, the American Battle Monuments Commission, and the Fine Arts Commission."

The proposed program of competition was given special attention by Mr. Delano, for the consideration of the Commission. General Cheatham submitted also a copy of a letter which the Secretary of War wrote to the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, regarding the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier (Exhibit O).

10. PRIVATE BUILDINGS ALONG PARKS AND PARKWAYS AND ADJACENT TO PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks, discussed with the Commission the subject of regulating the height, exterior design and construction of private buildings along parks and parkways and adjacent to public buildings. Colonel Grant said that he had been in conference with Mr. Moore, Mr. Medary, Mr. Frederic Delano, and also with Mr. Root on the subject, as a result of which he had prepared a draft of a proposed bill as follows:

> "BE IT ENACTED BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED, That, in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph 17, of Section 8, of Article I of the Constitution that 'Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district as may become the seat of government of the United States', and in keeping with the spirit of the laws, agreements and acts establishing the National Capital, the conveyance by the owners, 'in consideration of the great benefits expected,' to the President, of all the lands he might think proper to include within the Federal City,' granting him 'the sole power of laying off said city in what manner he pleased and to retain any number of squares he might think should be 'on such conditions as thought reasonable by the President for regulating the materials and manner of the buildings and improvements generally in the said city, or in particular streets or parts thereof for convenience, safety and order,' and in consideration of the benefits

inuring to the owners of adjacent property by the construction of public buildings and the establishment of parks and reservations, of such character and such surroundings as befit the dignity of the buildings and public grounds of this nation's capital, hereafter no permit for the erection or alteration of any building in the District of Columbia, any portion of which is to front upon or be located within 200 feet of any public building, or any public park, parkway, or reservation, except space for street parking, shall be granted until the plans therefor, so far as as they relate to height and exterior design and construction, have been submitted to and approved by the Commission of Fine Arts, and the erection or alteration of any building so located shall conform to the plans so approved."

Colonel Grant said that the suggestion has been made that the Bill have certain preambles, setting forth the reasons for the legislation; and that Mr. Root had felt that designs for buildings less than possibly 60 feet high might be exempted, so that the legislation might not be considered arbitrary.

The Commission regarded the proposed legislation and these suggestions favorably. The Commission again called attention to the need of legislation as proposed in view of the constant encroachments which are being made in this city on park and parkway areas. Mr. Moore called attention to the obstruction to a beautiful vista over the city from Meridian Hill Park, caused by the erection of the Hotel Roosevelt immediately to the south of it. During the day Mr. Garfield arranged by special appointment to see President Coolidge on the subject.

Colonel Grant said he expected to have a conference with Senator Shipsted regarding the bill in the near future with a view to having it introduced, though he felt action thereon could not be expected until some time at the next session of Congress. It was recalled that Senator Shipstead had recently protested against the erection of an apartment house on grounds adjacent to the Capitol.

11. MOUNT VERNON BOULEVARD: At the request of the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Agriculture, the Commission inspected a large map prepared by that Bureau of the Mount Vernon Boulevard, showing a proposed layout along the river front from Washington to Mount Vernon, Capt. P.St. J.Wilson, Chief Engineer, stated that it is proposed to submit this map to Congress, in connection with their report.

The Commission noted that the map conformed to that which the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission had favorably considered during an inspection trip to Wakefield, on October 16, 1926, but advised that special consideration be given to landscape treatment in developing the project. A report was made to the Bureau of Public Roads approving the "river route" for the Mount Vernon Boulevard, and suggesting that the boulevard be completed by 1932, the Bicentennial of the Birthday of George Washington. (Exhibit P)

12. AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT WORLD WAR MEMORIAL: The secretary called the attention of the Commission to a communication received from the World War Memorial Committee of the Agricultural Department reporting that Mr. John Flanagan, sculptor had promised them that he would have a plaster cast of their memorial tablet completed by May 30, 1927, but that because of the fact that his contract expired in May, 1925, they desired to have the memorial completed at the earliest date possible. The Commission took the matter under advisement.

The Commission had as their guests at luncheon Commissioner General Campbell and Mr. Dennison, of the Seville Exposition Commission; Major General B. F. Cheatham, The Quartermaster General, and Brigadier General H. F. Rethers, Assistant Quartermaster General, War Department; and Mr. Frank C. Baldwin, Secretary of The American Institute of Architects. After inspecting the portrait in the rooms of the Joint Committee on the Library at the Capitol, the Commission returned to resume the session, and adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

COPY

January 8, 1927.

Dear Major Price:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 8, 1927, considered the further study prepared by Dr. Paul P. Cret, Architect, for the memorial chapel in the Flanders Field American Military Cemetery, Waereghem, Belgium, as indicated by Scheme C, which you submitted with your letter of December 30th.

The Commission approve Scheme C, with the suggestion that the entrance door be enlarged and the facade restudied accordingly. The Commission feel that doubtless in due time the architect will submit studies of the interior of the chapel, which at present appears unstudied.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major J. H. Price, Secretary,
The American Battle Monuments Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT A.

COPY

January 8, 1927.

Dear Major Price:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 6, 1927, considered the designs which you submitted with your letter of December 30th, for a memorial chapel in the Meuse-Argonne American Military Cemetery, prepared by York and Sawyer, Architects, of New York City.

The Commission unanimously approve design B. It suggests a chapel very appropriate for the location and one having mystery and charm. The Commission regard Scheme A, suggesting a classical treatment, not well related to the site.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major J. W. Price, Secretary,
The American Battle Monuments Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT B.

COPY

January 18, 1927.

Dear Major Price:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 6, 1927, considered the further studies of design A for the Memorial Chapel at Brookwood, England, prepared by Mr. Egerton Swartwout, Architect, which you submitted with your letter of December 30th. The Commission approve the design.

The Commission recommend and strongly urge that the landscape treatment and walks at the rear of the chapel be restudied. A very inconspicuous treatment of flagstones set flush with the grass should be adopted. The formal hedge should be eliminated and the trees themselves should be so selected and planted as to form a solid green background on the hill in the rear of the chapel. In this way the chapel would appear to be simply set against the trees without formality.

The Commission suggest a further study of the axis leading from the British colonial area and the main axis of the American cemetery, with a view to an appropriate placing of the flagpole. One flagpole is sufficient and this one should be as inconspicuous as possible. In this particular cemetery the Commission would prefer to have the flagpole eliminated altogether as more in keeping with the nature of the place, but if this is not possible in the view of the American Battle Monuments Commission every effort should be made to minimize the flagstaff, so that it shall not seem to dominate other portions of the cemetery.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major H. H. Price, Secretary,
The American Battle Monuments Commission,
Washington, DC.

EXHIBIT C.

COPY

January 11, 1927.

Dear Major Price:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 6, 1927, inspected the plans which you submitted with your letter of December 30th, for a memorial monument to be erected near Bony, France, designed by Dr. Paul P. Cret.

The Commission approved Sketch A, showing the columns.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major J. H. Price, Secretary,
The American Battle Monuments Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D.

COPY

January 8, 1927.

Dear Major Price:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 6, 1927, considered the preliminary designs (Schemes A, B and C), for a memorial monument on Montsec, St. Mihiel, France, prepared by Mr. Egerton Swartwout, Architect, which you submitted with your letter of December 30th.

The Commission approved design A, showing the circular colonnade. The Commission regard this design more appropriate for the location proposed than design B, suggesting a square colonnade. The Commission feel that a circular colonnade is best adapted to the topography.

The Commission note with approval that Mr. Swartwout proposes to associate with himself Mr. James E. Fraser, as the sculptor of the symbolic figure indicated in the design. The Commission await further studies.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major U. S. Price, Secretary,
The American Battle Monuments Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT E.

COPY

January 8, 1927.

Dear Major Price:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 6, 1927, approved the design of the column for the World War Memorial at Montfaucon, prepared by Mr. John Russell Pope, Architect, of New York City.

The Commission suggest that from 10 to 20 acres be made available for landscape development in connection with this Memorial.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, Yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major W. H. Price, Secretary,
The American Battle Monuments Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT F.

COPY

January 11, 1927.

Dear Major Price:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 6, 1927, considered carefully the revised studies prepared at your request by Dr. Paul P. Cret, Architect, for the memorial monument at Chateau Thierry, France, suggesting a reduction in the size of the monument from that contemplated by the design which this Commission has approved.

The Commission regard it a mistake to reduce the size of the monument, which is none too large to be effective in the landscape. If for any reason the American Battle Monuments Commission should decide that a monument of the size contemplated by the approved design should not be erected at Chateau Thierry, the Commission of Fine Arts advise that an entirely new study be submitted by the architect.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major J. H. Price, Secretary,
The American Battle Monuments Commission,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT G.

COPY

January 18, 1927.

Dear Major Price:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 6, 1927, considered the revised designs for a memorial chapel in the Military Cemetery at Bony, France, prepared by Messrs. Mellor, Meigs and Howe, Architects, which you submitted with your letter of December 30th.

The Commission approve the design for this chapel as shown in Plan No.4. This particular design commended itself highly to this Commission. It is admirably suited to the landscape. It has a rare distinction in its simplicity and its directness in serving the purpose for which it is intended. It is truly monumental and it fits the cemetery.

The Commission approve the location as shown in Plan No.4. It may be necessary to raise the path surrounding the graves a few feet, thereby giving the chapel a higher elevation, so that it shall overlook the entire cemetery; that, however, is a simple matter. The walled enclosure as shown in the plan should be carried out.

When these elements shall be realized according to the plans presented the result will be highly satisfactory and appropriate.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major J. H. Price, Secretary,
The American Battle Monuments Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT H

COPY

January 8, 1927.

Dear Major Price:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 6, 1927, considered the design for a World War Memorial at Ypres, Belgium, prepared by Mellor, Meigs, and Howe, Architects, which you submitted with your letter of December 30th.

The design for this memorial is entirely acceptable to the Commission of Fine Arts. The Commission suggest that a scale drawing be made and submitted in accordance with this design.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major W. H. Price, Secretary,
The American Battle Monuments Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT I.

COPY

January 18, 1927.

Dear Major Price:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 6, 1927, gave careful consideration to the revised design which you submitted with your letter of December 30th for the memorial chapel in the Oise-Aisne American Military Cemetery, prepared by Messrs. Cram and Ferguson, Architects.

The Commission suggest that the purpose of the American Battle Monuments Commission in creating a chapel at this point would be better subserved if the plan, Scheme B,5-10, should be restudied, substituting one large open apse in the center and removing the two small apses from the end pavilions. The open apse in the center might contain an altar or other symbol of sacrifice, the flanking chapel and museum being developed to make a good balance of the whole. Such a plan, treated in the French romanesque manner, would produce a structure quite in keeping with the general plans of the American Battle Monuments Commission.

If the architects prefer they might restudy Scheme A, dated August 3, 1926, marked S-6, with the object of producing a chapel consisting of a single element (rather than the cruciform chapel) with the tower surmounting the crossing. The element suggested might be the nave of the cruciform chapel marked Scheme A, developed into a simple rectangular form, possibly terminating in an apse and designed in the French romanesque manner rather than in the later period indicated in Scheme B. For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,
Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Major F. H. Price, Secretary,
The American Battle Monuments Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT J.

COPY

January 8, 1927.

Dear Major Price:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 6, 1927, considered the revised design (Scheme C) for the memorial chapel in the Aisne-Marne American Military Cemetery, prepared by Messrs. Cram and Ferguson, Architects, which you submitted with your letter of December 30th.

The Commission noted that the architects carried out the recommendation heretofore made as to simplifying the design of the chapel but retaining the tower-like effect, and approved the design.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major U. H. Price, Secretary,
The American Battle Monuments Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT K.

COPY

January 14, 1927.

Dear Major Price:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 6, 1927, considered the revised design, which you submitted with your letter of December 10th, for the memorial chapel in the St. Mihiel Cemetery, Thiacourt, France, prepared by Thomas Harlan Ellett, Architect.

The Commission approve the design. The Commission note that the design contains the suggestion of a sculptural object on the pedestal in the center, and suggest that when this is developed further there be submitted studies indicating its final form.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major K. H. Price, Secretary,
The American Battle Monuments Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT L

COPY

January 7, 1927.

Dear Governor Campbell:

I enclosex a draft of a letter for you to change as you please and send to these six architects. The selection was made by the Commission of Fine Arts after consultation with you yesterday:

Mr. Arthur Brown, Jr., 251 Kearney Street, San Francisco, Cal.;

Mr. Marion Wyeth, Palm Beach, Florida;

Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue Associates, 2 West 47th Street, New York City;

Mr. Wm. E. Parsons, 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois;

Johnson, Kaufmann and Coate, 510 Union Bank Building, Los Angeles, Cal.;

Mr. Reginald Davis Johnson, 607 Union Bank Building, ~~San Francisco~~ Los Angeles, Cal.

After an architect has been selected this Commission will suggest to you a landscape architect to be associated with him.

For the Commission:

Very truly yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Hon. Thomas H. Campbell,
Commissioner General,
Seville International Exposition,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT M.

COPY

The United States will participate in the International Exposition to be held in Seville, Spain, in 1928. For the purpose of housing and showing the Government exhibits, buildings will be erected on two acres of land, in the midst of the exposition buildings, facing a boulevard and the Rio Guadalquivir. The Spanish buildings were begun several years ago and so far upwards of $5,000,000 have been spent upon them.

The Commission having the American representation in charge has decided that the central building of the American group shall be a permanent building suited for use as a United States consulate at the close of the exposition. Temporary buildings will be erected in proximity to the central building for the display to be made by the United States Departments. Private exhibitors will make their own arrangements elsewhere.

The Commission also has determined that the buildings shall be Spanish in character, representing or recalling the Spanish-American architecture.

For the purpose of selecting an architect to design the buildings the Commission is asking six architects who have worked in the Spanish-American style to submit photographs of their completed work. The selection of an architect will be based on these photographs. In making the selection of an architect this Commission will have the advice of the National Commission of Fine Arts.

Enclosed are franks that may be used to forward the package of photographs without the payment of postage.

COPY

January 11, 1927.

My dear Senator Fess:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 6, 1927, inspected the portrait of Theodore Roosevelt by George Burrows Torrey, in the room of the Joint Committee on the Library at the Capitol, as requested in your letter of January 4th.

The unanimous opinion of the Commission was that the picture is without merit as a likeness, a painting, or a work of art.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Hon. Simeon D. Fess, Chairman,
Joint Committee on the Library,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT N.

COPY

January 6, 1927.

The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed herewith for the information of the Commission is a copy of the program of competition for completion of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, as approved by the Secretary of War.

It will be noted in paragraph 4 that the total cost of the memorial, including the fees paid to the successful architects, is limited to $50,000.00; but it is proposed in the instructions to proposed contestants to include a paragraph to the following general effect:

> "The total sum available for the actual construction of this monument is $44,000.00, and all proposals submitted should come within that limitation. However, there is no objection to each bidder submitting with his proposal an alternate plan showing in detail the modification of the landscape, if any is required, to complete the proper setting of the proposed monument, together with an estimate of the cost of such alterations over and above the cost of the monument itself."

An expression of opinion by the Fine Arts Commission on this feature of the proposal will be appreciated, with such change or modification in language as it may desire to suggest.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War to the Military Affairs Committee, dated May 20, 1926, showing his views on the subject of the type of Tomb to be constructed.

Sincerely yours,

B. F. Cheatham,
Major General,
The Quartermaster General.

EXHIBIT C.

COPY

May 20, 1926.

My dear Senator:

In accordance with your request for a statement of my ideas on the subject of the proposed completion of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, I am glad to send you a statement of my personal views:

I find that a misapprehension exists among some members of Congress who think that the War Department desires to construct a tall shaft or monument which would be out of keeping with the Tomb itself and with the surroundings. This is entirely erroneous as no such plan is under contemplation; in fact, there are no plans or sketches prepared as this would be done only in case the proposed appropriation is passed. I believe that the designs for the proposed completion of the Tomb should be made by one of the best artists in the country and that perhaps a competition for the design should be held. It might be desirable to amend the Resolution so as to enable the cost of the design to be paid for from the appropriation, if such wording is necessary.

My own idea is that the completed Tomb should be comparatively low in size; should be as simple, dignified and beautiful as it can possibly be made and should harmonize with the amphitheatre and its surroundings. Before any structure is erected a paste-board model should be put on the pedestal in order to see how the completed structure would look. I understand that, under the law, the designs would be submitted to the Fine Arts Commission, and if it were desired to have them passed upon by any other body, I see no objection to this procedure. The important thing is to get the most beautiful work of art that can be conceived symbolical of the sacrifice which the Tomb itself represents and in keeping with the surroundings in which it is located. I hope that some plan can be worked out by which the Tomb can be completed as it seems to me that the present incomplete structure is not in keeping with the sentiment we all have for those who died in the war.

Hoping that this gives you the information desired,
I am,

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) [illegible],
Secretary of War.

The Honorable David A. Reed,
United States Senate.

COPY

January 7, 1927.

Dear Capt. in Wilson:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 6, 1927, inspected the map in your office, showing alternative routes for a boulevard to Mount Vernon, one along the Potomac River and the other an interior route. The Commission of Fine Arts are unanimous in their advice in favor of the river route, as being both interesting and historic. Not a little of the route is within the District of Columbia, part of it traverses land already owned by the Government (Fort Hunt) and all of it is adjacent to the improvement of the Potomac River channels. The Commission suggest that the boulevard be completed by 1932, the Bicentennial of the Birthday of George Washington.

The Commission of Fine Arts, in company with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, made a trip of inspection to Wakefield, on October 16, 1926, during which the shore line to Mount Vernon was given special attention and at that time the river front line was heartily endorsed.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Capt. P. St.J. Wilson,
Chief Engineer,
Bureau of Public Roads,
Department of Agriculture.

EXHIBIT P